REMARKS

Claims 1-16, 18-36 and 38 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-16, 18-36 and 38 have been rejected.

Claims 1, 12, 14, 28, and 38 have been amended.

Claim 39 has been added. Support for claim 39 is found, at least, at Applicants' specification, page 9. No new matter is added.

Formal Matters

Applicants express appreciation for the Examiner interview conducted March 31, 2008 between Examiner Won and Applicants' representative Shawn Doman. The topics of discussion included independent claim 1 and dependent claims 12 and 38. Based on the explanation of claim 12 provided by Applicants' representative, Examiner Won agreed that the cited sections of Kao do not teach the limitations of claim 12. Specifically, if fields 404 and 406 of Kao's FIG. 4 correspond to the fields recited in claim 12, which Applicant's concede only for the purpose of this argument, the cited passages of Kao fail to disclose any means of selectively including one or more of the fields to be audited, while not including others.

Applicants have amended claim 12 to further clarify the distinction discussed. Claim 12, as amended, reads:

12. The apparatus of claim 1, wherein the one or more business components further comprise a plurality of fields, and the apparatus further comprising:

means for selecting a selected field of the plurality of fields to be audited, wherein the means for selecting a selected field is further configured to exclude one or more fields of the plurality of fields from auditing; and

means for generating an audit transaction record when one of the selected operations on the selected field is detected.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above amendments further clarify one distinction between claim 12 and the cited passages of Kao. Namely, claim 12 discloses the

capability to select certain fields of a business component to be included in an audit while excluding others. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited passages of Kao fail to disclose any such capability. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of claim 12, and an indication of allowability of the same.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-5, 7-16, 18-27, 29-36 and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,070,177 issued to Kao et al., ("Kao"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to further clarify the distinction between claim 1 and the cited passages of Kao. Claim 1, as amended, now reads:

1. An apparatus comprising:

an application program comprising

    one or more business components, wherein a business component

        comprises one or more fields, wherein

        the fields correspond to records in a database, and the database is

        separate from the application program,

    means for selecting for auditing a business component from the one or

        more business components,

    means for selecting for auditing one or more selected operations of a

        plurality of operations, wherein

        the operations are configured to operate on the selected business

        component, and the means for selecting for auditing one or more

        selected operations is further configured to exclude one or more

        operations of the plurality of operations from auditing,

    means for creating an audit trail for the application program, and

    means for providing the audit trail to the database associated with the

        fields of the business component.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited passages of Kao fail to disclose, at least, the capability of selecting certain operations for inclusion in an audit trail and others for exclusion from the audit trail.

- 10 -

The Office Action cites Kao 5:4-7 and 7:22-39 as purportedly teaching "selecting for auditing one or more selected operations." The cited passages disclose users receiving, approving, and modifying database forms. Even if the disclosed receiving, approving, and modifying could be equated to the claimed operations, a point which Applicants do not concede, the cited passages of Kao fail to disclose the capability of including one or more of those "operations" in an audit trail while excluding others.

Further, the Office Action equates the claimed business components with "specifically tailored database forms" disclosed by Kao 1:34-36. Office Action, page 3. Applicants respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill would be expected to understand that even when interpreted as broadly as is reasonably possible, a database form cannot accurately be described as a business component. A database form is "simply a template that provides data entry fields." Kao 5:2-3. Kao's database forms are used as electronic equivalents to "replace circulation of certain documents, such as requests for services or products." Kao 1:42-44.

On the other hand, a business component is used to store information for an item, person, or other entity in a table or record. *See* Specification, p. 9, last paragraph. The Office Action states that any document taught by Kao is a business component. Applicants respectfully disagree. Office Action, p. 11. Even interpreted as broadly as possible, a business component cannot be considered merely a form or template for data entry. Instead, as is clearly disclosed by the specification, examples of business components include tables, or records which hold information relating to banking accounts, sales leads, and service representatives.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited passages of Kao fail to disclose each recited element of independent claim 1, as amended, and independent claims 14 and 24, which have been amended to include similar limitations to those recited in claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections, and indication of allowability of these claims. Applicants further submit that dependent claims 2-13, 15, 16, 18-23, 25-36, and 38 are similarly allowable, at least by virtue of depending from allowable base claims.

Regarding claim 10, Applicants presented in the previous response that the cited passages of Kao fail to teach a means for querying one or more of the audit transaction

records. The Office Action states that "Kao teaches the ability for users to view transmission history" and that "it is inherent that the history needs to be requested (i.e., searched, queried)." Applicants respectfully disagree and reassert the arguments made previously. Applicants respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize a difference between viewing a history (as taught by Kao), and querying an audit transaction record (as claimed). This argument is bolstered by the fact that Kao discloses that the history is viewable without searching or querying of any kind as the history is transmitted and displayed along with the document it relates to. *See, e.g.*, Kao 5:49-56. Thus Kao has no need to query an audit trail, since the audit history is viewable along with the form it accompanies.

Further support for the position that Kao fails to disclose the claimed means for querying the audit transaction records is provided by the Applicants' specification, which discloses that querying can include keyword searches and the like. *See* Specification, p. 16, first paragraph. Such functionality as keyword searching is commonly associated with the "querying" by those of ordinary skill in the art. However, no such functionality is disclosed by Kao. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Kao fails to disclose each limitation recited in claim 10. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 6 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,056,786 issued to Rivera et al. ("Rivera"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. As discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that Kao fails to disclose each element of independent claims 1 and 24, from which claims 6 and 28, respectively, depend. Specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that Kao fails to disclose, at least, means for selecting one or more operations for auditing, the means being further configured to exclude one or more operations from auditing. Since Rivera is not cited as purportedly supplying this missing disclosure, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 6 and 28 are patentable over the proposed combination of Kao and Rivera.

New Claims

Applicants have added dependent claim 39. Support for claim 39 is found, at least, at Applicants' specification, page 9. No new matter is added. New claim 39 recites:

> 39. The apparatus of claim 1, wherein
>
> the business component comprises a table which includes information for an item, person, or other entity.

As discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed business component is not comparable to the database forms disclosed in the cited passages of Kao. Claim 39 further clarifies the distinction between the two. A database form, as cited by the Office Action and disclosed by Kao, does not incorporate the claimed table. Kao provides no indication that Kao's forms contemplate the inclusion of such tables.

For at least these reasons, and those discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 39 is allowable over Kao.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application and the claims therein are believed to be in condition for allowance without any further examination and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 512-439-5092.

If any extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) are required in order for this submission to be considered timely, Applicant hereby petitions for such extensions. Applicant also hereby authorizes that any fees due for such extensions or any other fee associated with this submission, as specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17, be charged to deposit account 502306.

Respectfully submitted,

Shawn Doman
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 60,362
Telephone: (512) 439-5092
Facsimile: (512) 439-5099